arXiv:1610.05246v1 [math.ST] 17 Oct 2016

# BET on Independence

Kai Zhang
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

October 18, 2016

**Abstract**

We study the problem of model-free dependence detection. This problem can be difficult even when the marginal distributions are known. We explain this difficulty by showing the impossibility to uniformly consistently distinguish degeneracy from independence with any single test. To make model-free dependence detection a tractable problem, we introduce the concept of binary expansion statistics (BEStat) and propose the binary expansion testing (BET) framework. Through simple mathematics, we convert the dependence detection problem to a multiple testing problem. Besides being model-free, the BET also enjoys many other advantages which include (1) invariance to monotone marginal transformations, (2) clear interpretability of local relationships upon rejection, and (3) close connections to computing for efficient algorithms. We illustrate the BET by studying the distribution of the brightest stars in the night sky.

## 1 Introduction

Independence is one of the most important concepts that is the foundation of many statistical theory and methods. It is also one of the most common assumptions in statistics literature. It is thus an important problem to verify the independence condition with data, since if we are not able to check this crucial condition, then we are "betting on independence" at the risk of losing the validity of all consequent results. Many careful classical studies have been done in the past, mostly under some assumptions on the model of the joint distribution such as the multivariate normal distribution. However, in practice one rarely knows the model for the joint distribution. In a situation without a model nor any parameters, how well can we check the independence condition? Can we still distinguish dependence from independence?

In this paper we study the dependence detection problem in a model-free setting, in which we do not make any assumption on the joint distribution. We shall begin with a very simple case of only two continuous variables, where we observe $n$ i.i.d. copies of $(X, Y)$ as $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$. To make things simpler, we shall further assume that the marginal distributions of $X$ and $Y$, $F_X(x)$ and $F_Y(y)$, are both known. By making these simple

assumptions, we single out the problem of detecting dependence in the joint distribution. Although this setup seems to be overly ideal, we shall show in Section 2 that the dependence detection problem can be very difficult in this model-free setting.

Existing tests of independence between two continuous variables are usually based on some measure of dependence. One of the most classical measures is Pearson correlation, which has an important property that it can be interpreted as a measure of linear relationship. Classical results connecting correlation and independence including Rényi (1959) have lead to useful methods such as Breiman and Friedman (1985). One important recent generalization of correlation is the distance correlation (Székely et al., 2007; Székely et al., 2009). Distance correlation possesses the crucial property that a zero distance correlation implies independence of the variables. Tests based on sample versions of the distance correlation (Székely and Rizzo, 2013a,b) have since been popular methods in practice.

Another important approach to detecting dependence is based on the binning idea. By discretizing $X$ and $Y$ into finite many categories, classical statistical or information theoretical methods can be applied to study the dependence. Miller and Siegmund (1982) studied the maximally selected $\chi^2$ statistics from forming $2 \times 2$ tables through partitions of data. Reshef et al. (2011, 2015a,b) introduced the maximal information coefficient (MIC) by aggregating information from optimal partitions of the scatterplot for different partition sizes. Heller et al. (2012, 2016) studied optimal permutation tests over partitions to improve the power. A recent paper by Wang et al. (2016) considered a generalized $R^2$ to detect piecewise linear relationships, a compromise between the correlation approach and the binning approach that takes advantages of both. We note here that the procedures in Székely et al. (2007) and Heller et al. (2012) can also be used to study associations between random vectors.

Although we have many classical and modern tests of independence, the problem of distinguishing dependence from independence is far from settled. The difficulty is from the fact that the space of alternatives is dense: When two variables are not independent, there are so many ways they can be dependent. The relationship can be nonlinear, nonsmooth, noncontinuous, or even non-functional. In fact, even degenerate bivariate distributions, which are strong forms of dependence, can be difficult to distinguish from independent ones, even when the marginal distributions are known. Section 2.1 provides an example to illustrate such difficulty. In general, we show in Section 2.2 a theorem that there exists no single uniformly consistent test to detect all kinds of degeneracy.

The above pessimistic results show that the problem of model-free dependence detection is in general intractable, which we discuss in details in Section 2. To make this problem tractable, we propose to decompose dependence into many layers such that (1) the layers accumulatively approximate the true underlying dependence structure, and (2) at every layer, the problem is tractable. We find similar ideas nicely described in Liu and Meng (2014, 2016). In this paper, the layers are constructed through the classical probabilistic result on the binary expansion of a uniformly distributed variable into i.i.d. Bernoulli variables (Kac, 1959). Through a truncation of binary expansions of marginal distributions, the resulting distribution at each truncation is equivalent to a contingency table, to which classical categorical data analysis can be applied. Such truncated variables also converge

to the original joint distribution. Therefore, the binary expansion of marginal distributions provides a tractable way of learning dependence.

We call the statistics that are functions of the Bernoulli variables from marginal binary expansions binary expansion statistics (BEStat), and we call the testing framework on the overall independence by testing the independence at each truncation the binary expansion testing (BET) framework. Although classical tests such as the $\chi^2$ tests and Fisher's exact tests (Lehmann and Romano, 2006) are readily available, we propose to improve them on (1) the number of layers we can study, and (2) the interpretability of the statistical significance. Such improvements are obtained through a connection to a multiple testing problem, where we consider an orthogonal decomposition of dependence into interactions from the binary expansion. The test of independence is then reduced to checking if each interaction variable is marginally symmetrically distributed.

We also note that the BEStat approach is closely related to computer science. In current standard computing systems, each decimal number is coded as a sequence of binary bits, which is exactly the binary expansion of that number. This connection means that one can carry out the BEStat procedures by operating directly on the bits. Since bitwise operations are one of the most efficient operations in current computing systems, the results in this paper have the potential to be computationally efficient.

The paper is organized in as follows: Section 2 explains the difficulty of dependence detection in a model-free setting. Section 3 introduces the concept of binary expansion statistics. Section 4 studies binary expansion testing procedures. Section 5 and Section 6 illustrate the procedure with simulated and real data studies. Section 7 concludes the paper with discussions of future work. The proofs can be found in the supplemental file.

# 2 Intractability of Model-Free Dependence Detection

## 2.1 Challenge from the Bisection Expanding Cross: Total Dependence or Total Independence?

We call the following sequence of one-dimensional manifolds in $[0,1]^2$ the bisection expanding cross (BEX). These manifolds can be defined through the following implicit function $B_d(x,y)=0$ for every positive integer $d$: $BEX_d = \{(x,y)\in[0,1]^2 : B_d(x,y)=0\}$, where

$$B_d(x,y)=\sum_{i=1}^{2^{d-1}}\sum_{j=1}^{2^{d-1}}\left(\left|x-\frac{i}{2^{d-1}}+\frac{1}{2^d}\right|-\left|y-\frac{j}{2^{d-1}}+\frac{1}{2^d}\right|\right)\mathrm{I}\left(\left|x-\frac{i}{2^{d-1}}+\frac{1}{2^d}\right|\le\frac{1}{2^d}\right)\mathrm{I}\left(\left|y-\frac{j}{2^{d-1}}+\frac{1}{2^d}\right|\le\frac{1}{2^d}\right). \tag{2.1}$$

Graphically, this grid can be regarded as a fractal with the following recursive construction steps:




Figure 1: The bisection expanding cross (BEX) at level $d = 1, \ldots, 4$.

(1) $BEX_1$ is the usual "cross" in the unit square defined by the implicit function:

$$B_1(x, y) = \left| x - \frac{1}{2} \right| - \left| y - \frac{1}{2} \right| = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

(2) $BEX_d$ with $d \geq 2$ is constructed by expanding the bisector of each of the $4^{d-1}$ "arms" of $BEX_{d-1}$ until intersection.

The construction of the BEX is illustrated in Figure 1, where the first four levels are plotted. We state without proof two easy but important properties of the BEX:

**Proposition 2.1.**

*(a) (The BEX is hierarchical)* $BEX_d \subset BEX_{d+1}$.

*(b) (The BEX is space filling) The distance from any point in* $[0, 1]^2$ *to* $BEX_d$ *is bounded by* $2^{-d-1/2}$. *In particular, the maximal distance converges to 0 as* $d \to \infty$.

Now we consider the random variables $(X_d, Y_d)$ that are uniformly distributed over $BEX_d$. The properties of these distributions are summarized in the following proposition, in which Part (c) can be regarded as a consequence of Proposition 2.1.

**Proposition 2.2.**

*(a)* $X_d$ *and* $Y_d$ *are marginally* $Uniform[0, 1]$ *for any d.*

*(b)* $\mathbf{P}(B_d(X_d, Y_d) = 0) = 1$ *for any d, i.e., the joint distribution of* $(X, Y)$ *is degenerate.*

*(c) Fix any point* $(x, y)$ *on* $BEX_{d_0}$ *at some fixed level* $d_0$. *For* $d \to \infty$,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_d \leq x, Y_d \leq y) \to xy = \mathbf{P}(X_d \leq x)\mathbf{P}(Y_d \leq y) \tag{2.3}$$

Part (b) and part (c) of Proposition 2.2 seem to contradict each other: Part (b) says that $X_d$ and $Y_d$ are strongly dependent — the support of $(X_d, Y_d)$ is in a lower dimensional manifold. Yet, part (c) claims that when $d$ is large, $X_d$ and $Y_d$ are almost independent. A

naive student might think degenerate random variables behave dramatically differently from independent ones. The BEX can be regarded as a counterexample to such a wrong intuition. Indeed, the BEX shows that degenerate distributions can be arbitrarily close to independent ones. This fact in turn makes model-free dependence detection a difficult challenge: Given a finite sample, can we effectively distinguish dependence from independence?

To see how well we can detect the dependence in the BEX with existing methods, we sampled 50 observations from the uniform distribution over the $BEX_5$. The plot of the points are shown in Figure 2. The dependence pattern is not apparent without the grids shown. We apply the tests based on correlation and distance correlation to these 50 samples.




Figure 2: (a) 50 samples from the uniform distribution over $BEX_5$. The grid pattern is not apparent. (b) Same 50 points as in (a) with $BEX_5$ grids in the background.

The correlation is $-0.14$ and the $p$-value is 0.36. This is expected since there is no linear relationship in the BEX grids. The distance correlation is 0.22 and the $p$-value is 0.46. This result of insignificance again illustrates the difficulty of model-free dependence detection: The uniform distribution over $BEX_5$ is very close to independence and is very difficult to be distinguished from it.

We make a few remarks about the BEX example.

(1) Why don't correlation or distance correlation work in this example? We note that one intuition behind correlation and distance correlation is that when $X$ and $Y$ are highly dependent, the points in the scatterplot tend to have smaller pairwise distances, or, to be "clustered together." Although this intuition is true for the multivariate normal distribution and many other distributions, it is not true for the BEX: There are many empty spaces between the grid lines in the BEX. These empty spaces are forcing the data points on the BEX to spread out despite the strong dependence.

As a consequence, such dependence structures are difficult to be captured by these methods. See Section 5.2 for simulation studies. Similar phenomena can happen when the dependence is through some implicit function, for example a circle.

(2) Although the uniform distribution over the BEX is uncommon in statistics literature, the BEX is a very common structure in reality, nets for example. The BEX grids are also closely related to the chessboard detection problem in computer vision (Forsyth and Ponce, 2002).

(3) We note that some statistical papers consider the length of prediction intervals as a criterion for comparing the performance of different methods. The BEX example indicates that this criterion might not be the best criterion for all cases: For $(X, Y)$ uniformly distributed on $BEX_d$ at some $d$, given $X$, a 100% prediction interval for $Y$ can be constructed as small as a set of finitely many points. Such a prediction interval has a length of 0. However, when $d$ is large, $X$ and $Y$ are almost independent so that $X$ is not of much of prediction power for $Y$.

(4) The BEX is not the first example in literature that a sequence of degenerate distributions converges to independence. The earliest reference of such an example we could find is in Kimeldorf and Sampson (1978). There are also other interesting and useful fractal applications in statistics such as Craiu and Meng (2005, 2006). The basis of the BEX example is an important classical result in Vitale (1990). We construct the BEX example due to the simplicity of the uniform distribution over the BEX, which turns out to be the key in the proof of Theorem 2.3.

We conclude this section by reporting the performance of the proposed BET method to be introduced in Section 4. When applied to the 50 samples data from the BEX, the Bonferroni BET at depth $d = 6$ returns a $p$-value $7.05036 \times 10^{-12}$. Compared to the results from existing methods, the improvement by the BET is about a trillion times in terms of $p$-value. This result demonstrates the power of model-free dependence detection from the BET approach. The calculation of this $p$-value will be explained in Section 4.4. We will provide more thorough simulation studies of detecting the BEX structure in Section 5.2.

## 2.2 Intractability of Dependence Detection in a Model-Free Setting

The BEX example reflects a general result: There exists no single test that is uniformly consistent in detecting all types of dependence, not even all types of degeneracy. This general result is formally stated below.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Consider the test*

$$H_0 : X \text{ and } Y \text{ are independent } \text{ v.s. } \ H_1 : (X, Y) \text{ is degenerate}$$

*For any finite number of i.i.d. observations $n$, for any test that has a Lebesgue measurable critical region $C_n \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ with $\mathbf{P}_{H_0}(\partial C_n) = 0$ and $\mathbf{P}_{H_0}(C_n) \leq \alpha$, $\forall \epsilon > 0$, there exists a bivariate distribution $F_n \in H_1$ and $\mathbf{P}_{F_n}(C_n) \leq \alpha + \epsilon$.*

Unfortunately, all of the asymptotically consistent tests described in Section 1 suffer from this power loss in finite samples. The message from this result is that in a model-free setting without any assumption on the joint distribution, dependence is not a tractable target with any single fixed function of data. The intractability comes from the fact that without a model of the joint distribution, there is no parameter to characterize and identify the dependence. Therefore, there is no target of inference about dependence from a test or any other statistical method. Although one can develop good measures of dependence such as distance correlation and MIC, such measures are not identifiable for the joint distribution. Therefore, they can never replace the role of parameters in statistical inference about dependence. This fact motivates the following three key elements in the BEStat approach:

(1) Rather than one measure of dependence, we will study dependence through a carefully designed sequence of statistics.

(2) For every statistic in the sequence, there is an explicit well-defined set of parameters as the target for inference.

(3) As the sequence tends towards infinity, the sets of parameters shall better and better approximate the true underlying dependence.

We explain the details of the BEStat approach in Section 3.

# 3 Binary Expansion Statistics

We start by citing two classical results: the probability integral transformation (Casella and Berger, 2002) and the binary expansion of a uniformly distributed variable (Kac, 1959).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that a random variable $X$ has a continuous distribution for which the known cumulative distribution function (CDF) is $F_X(x)$. Then the random variable $U = F_X(X) \sim Uniform[0,1]$.*

**Theorem 3.2.** *For $U \sim Uniform[0,1]$, we have $U = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\widetilde{A}_k}{2^k}$ where $\widetilde{A}_k \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} Bernoulli(1/2)$.*

We note here that in describing the theory and methods, it would be more convenient to consider $A_k = 2\widetilde{A}_k - 1 \sim Rademacher$, i.e., $\mathbf{P}(A_k = 1) = \mathbf{P}(A_k = -1) = 1/2$. We shall use this notation in Section 4.

In what follows, we utilize these two classical results in this section to construct the binary expansion statistics.

## 3.1 Copula and Invariance to Marginal Transformation

With Theorem 3.1, instead of $X$ and $Y$, we can consider random variables $U$ and $V$ defined by

$$U = F_X(X) \quad \text{and} \quad V = F_Y(Y) \tag{3.1}$$

so that $U$ and $V$ are both uniformly distributed over $[0,1]$. The joint distribution is referred to in literature as the copula distribution (Nelsen, 2007). One important property of these transformations is that they preserve the dependence within the joint distribution of $(X,Y)$. In particular, $U$ and $V$ are independent if and only if $X$ and $Y$ are independent. Therefore, to test the independence between $X$ and $Y$ is equivalent to testing the dependence between $U$ and $V$, which is what we propose to do in the rest of the paper.

One advantage of considering the joint distribution of $U$ and $V$ is that we can focus on the joint distributions over $[0,1]^2$. The statistics and procedures developed over $[0,1]^2$ is thus invariant to monotone marginal transformations, which can be a useful property in practice. When the marginal distributions of $X$ and $Y$ are not known, we have to estimate them. We consider these issues in Section 4.5. We also provide a related simulation study in Section 5.

### 3.2 Binary Expansion and Binary Expansion Statistics

The binary expansion in Theorem 3.2 decomposes the information about $U$ into information from independent fair coins $\widetilde{A}_k$'s. $\widetilde{A}_k$'s can be also regarded as indicator functions of $U$. For example, $\widetilde{A}_1 = \mathrm{I}(\mathrm{U} \in (1/2, 1])$, $\widetilde{A}_2 = \mathrm{I}(\mathrm{U} \in (1/4, 1/2] \cup (3/4, 1])$, $\widetilde{A}_3 = \mathrm{I}(\mathrm{U} \in (1/8, 1/4] \cup (3/8, 1/2] \cup (5/8, 3/4] \cup (7/8, 1])$, see Kac (1959). To study the dependence between $U$ and $V$, we consider the binary expansion of both $U$ and $V$:

$$U = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\widetilde{A}_k}{2^k}, \qquad V = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\widetilde{B}_k}{2^k} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\widetilde{A}_k \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} Bernoulli(1/2)$ and $\widetilde{B}_k \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} Bernoulli(1/2)$.

Note that if we truncate the binary expansions of $U$ and $V$ at some finite depth $d$,

$$U_d = \sum_{k=1}^{d} \frac{\widetilde{A}_k}{2^k}, \qquad V_d = \sum_{k=1}^{d} \frac{\widetilde{B}_k}{2^k}, \tag{3.3}$$

then $U_d$ and $V_d$ are two discrete variables that can take $2^d$ possible values. Moreover, as $d \to \infty$, $U_d \to U$ and $V_d \to V$ in probability. These convergence results in turn imply that

$$(U_d, V_d) \xrightarrow{prob.} (U, V). \tag{3.4}$$

The important message from (3.4) is that one can approximate the joint distribution of and hence the dependence in $(U,V)$ through that in $(U_d, V_d)$. Although the dependence in the joint distribution of $(U,V)$ can be arbitrarily difficult, when $d$ is large, we expect a good approximation from discrete variables $(U_d, V_d)$. Moreover, for any $d$, the joint distribution of $(U_d, V_d)$ can only take a finite $2^{2d}$ possible values. In terms of data, this means we have a partition of the scatterplot into a $2^d \times 2^d$ contingency table. See Figure 3 for an example. With this consideration, the truncation of the binary expansions at $d$ turns the problem of dependence, which is intractable under the model-free setting, into a problem

over a contingency table, which is fully tractable. At each depth $d$, this contingency table is a well-studied subject, has an explicit exponential family model, and has the cell probabilities as explicit parameters (Agresti and Kateri, 2011; Fienberg, 2007). Therefore, the three elements at the end of Section 2 are achieved with the binary expansions. No matter how complicated the dependence between $U$ and $V$ is, we can consistently describe the dependence up to any fixed depth $d$ in the binary expansion. When $d$ is sufficiently large, such descriptions are good descriptions of the joint distribution of $(U, V)$.




Figure 3: The $2^3 \times 2^3$ BET contingency table for $d = 3$. For the data point $(u, v) = (0.861, 0.735)$ (marked with a blue cross), the first three binary expansions of $u$ are $\widetilde{a}_1 = 1, \widetilde{a}_2 = 1$, and $\widetilde{a}_3 = 0$, and the first three binary expansions of $v$ are $\widetilde{b}_1 = 1, \widetilde{b}_2 = 0$, and $\widetilde{b}_3 = 1$. These $\widetilde{a}_k$'s and $\widetilde{b}_k$'s locate the data point in the corresponding cell.

The above considerations motivate us to propose the binary expansion statistics in studying the dependence between $U$ and $V$ in a model-free setting. Formally, we define binary expansion statistics as follows:

**Definition 3.3.** *We call statistics as functions of finitely many Bernoulli variables from marginal binary expansions as in Theorem 3.2 the binary expansion statistics (BEStat).*

Similarly, for the problem of detecting dependence from independence in a model-free setting, we define the binary expansion testing framework as follows.

**Definition 3.4.** *We call the framework to test the independence of variables based on their binary expansion statistics up to the depth d the binary expansion testing (BET) at depth d.*

We shall focus on the BET on independence in the rest of the paper and will investigate other inference problems with BEStat in future work.

### 3.3 Connection to Computing

Reader may now have two questions about the binary expansion approach: (1) Can we try other ways of partitioning the scatterplot rather than the binary expansion? (2) Would the $2^{2d}$ cells cause any unnecessary computing burden? Our response to these questions is the close connections to the current computing system, which is a main advantage of the binary expansion approach.

One of the most important features of the current computing system is its binary architecture. By turning a electrical circuit "on" (represented by "1") and "off" (represented by "0"), computers process information with unprecedented speed and power. In particular, each decimal number in computing is processed with as a rounded version of its binary representation. For example, calculations of the decimal number $0.1_{10} = 0.0\overline{0011}_2$ is based on a rounded version of $0.0\overline{0011}_2$ to certain bits (depending on a 32-bit or 64-bit computing system).

The key observation here is that *the binary representation of a decimal number is precisely its binary expansion!* This fact implies that as long as a statistician is processing data with a computing device (desktop, laptop, smartphone, hand-held calculator...), the binary expansions of the numerical values are given to him/her automatically. These binary bits are hidden resources of data available for statisticians from computers. We often use bits for computing, but we need to realize that *these bits are data too.* The BEStat approach thus provides statisticians the access to the most fundamental level of a computing system and enables us to operate directly on the bits. For example, the locating process of a data point to the corresponding cell in the contingency table can be done through some bitwise Boolean operations over the $\widetilde{a}_k$'s and $\widetilde{b}_k$'s. Such bitwise operations are known to be computationally efficient. We thus expect fast software implementations of procedures based on binary expansion statistics. Of course, the complete implementation deserves a very careful development and another research paper, so we leave it for future work.

## 4 Binary Expansion Testing on Independence

### 4.1 BET with Classical Methods

Section 3.2 introduces the concepts of BEStat and the BET which approximate the dependence in $(U, V)$ by truncating the binary expansions at a finite depth $d$. Such a truncation makes the BET at depth $d$ equivalent to the test of independence of a $2^d \times 2^d$ contingency

table. The probability model for the contingency table is a multinomial model with cell probabilities as parameters, which are constrained due to fixed marginal distributions. For readability, the details of this well-known probability model are described and studied in the supplemental file. With this probability model, conventional tests, such as the $\chi^2$ test and the Fisher's exact test (Lehmann and Romano, 2006; Fienberg, 2007; Agresti and Kateri, 2011), can be directly applied to the table. However, there are two drawbacks of these classical procedures:

(1) Current asymptotic theories about the classical tests usually assume $n > 2^{2d}$ (Agresti and Kateri, 2011). This in turn means $d = O(\log n)$ and we cannot go very "deep", e.g., in the BEX hierarchy with 50 samples. When $d$ is higher, there will be empty rows and columns in the contingency table, and there is no theoretical guarantee for the probability statements. Although one can obtain a valid $p$-value through simulations, such simulations could incur high computing expenses.

(2) Moreover, the rejections from classical tests are not very interpretable. Although we can claim significance against independence with a small $p$-value, the result does not provide information about how the variables are dependent. We cannot describe the relationship between $U_d$ and $V_d$ with a rejection from a $\chi^2$ BET or Fisher's exact BET.

In the rest of the section, we try to improve the BET in these two aspects. In Section 4.2 we introduce the key idea of cross interactions between $\widetilde{A}_k$'s and $\widetilde{B}_k$'s. In Section 4.3 we convert the test of independence into a multiple testing problem and use the Bonferroni method to control the family-wise error rate. In Section 4.4 we provide the interpretation of the Bonferroni BET through examples. In Section 4.5 we discuss practical issues when the BET is applied.

## 4.2 Cross Interactions

To study the dependence between $U$ and $V$, we need to consider their joint behavior. This consideration leads to the use of cross interaction variables of $\widetilde{A}_k$'s and $\widetilde{B}_k$'s. In fact, one key observation here is that the dependence between $U_d$ and $V_d$ can be decomposed into these cross interactions. The idea comes from the classical decomposition of a contingency table in Lancaster (1949). For convenience, it is better to use the Rademacher variables $A_k$'s and $B_k$'s instead. With these Rademacher variables, each cross interaction can be represented as a product $A_{k_1} \dots A_{k_s} B_{k'_1} \dots B_{k'_t}, s, t = 1, \dots, d$. For example, $A_1 B_2$ is a cross interaction variable, but $A_1 A_2$ is not since no $B_k$ from $V$ is involved.

We state without proof below two easy facts about these cross interaction variables.

**Proposition 4.1.**

*(a) Each cross interaction variable can only take two possible values of* 1 *and* $-1$*, but it is not necessarily Rademacher (symmetric with mean 0).*

*(b) For each $d$, there are $(2^d-1)^2$ cross interaction variables, matching the degrees of freedom in the $\chi^2$ test of independence.*




Figure 4: The 9 cross interactions when $d = 2$. The white regions correspond to when the interaction is 1. There are totally 16 cells with 8 in each color.

Figure 4 illustrates the 9 cross interactions when $d = 2$. Graphically, each cross interaction is to color $2^{2d-1}$ cells with white $(+1)$ and the other $2^{2d-1}$ cells with blue $(-1)$. For example, the event $\{A_1B_1A_2 = 1\}$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}\{A_1B_1A_2 = 1\} =& \{A_1 = 1, A_2 = 1, B_1 = 1\} \cup \{A_1 = 1, A_2 = -1, B_1 = -1\} \\ & \cup \{A_1 = -1, A_2 = 1, B_1 = -1\} \cup \{A_1 = -1, A_2 = -1, B_1 = 1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, to check a data point is in white or blue for some cross interaction is to check the corresponding product of $a_k$'s and $b_k$'s. For example, for the data point $(u, v) = (0.861, 0.735)$, the first two binary expansions of $u$ are $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 = 1$, and the first two binary expansions of $v$ are $b_1 = 1$ and $b_2 = -1$. For cross interaction $A_1B_1A_2$ the point is

in the white region since $a_1 b_1 a_2 = 1$, but for cross interaction $A_2 B_2$ the point is in the blue region since $a_2 b_2 = -1$.

An important property of these cross interactions is the orthogonality of design (Box et al., 2005; Cox and Reid, 2000).

**Proposition 4.2.** *The cross interaction variables lead to a balanced orthogonal full factorial design for the cell probabilities.*

Graphically speaking, the orthogonality here means if we code each of the $2^{2d}$ cells with $+1$ or $-1$ corresponding to white or blue, these $(2^d - 1)^2$ vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{2^{2d}}$ are orthogonal to each other. Therefore, the cross interaction variables can be regarded as an orthogonal basis of the dependence in $(U_d, V_d)$. In particular, under the null hypothesis of independence, the cross interaction variables are pairwise independent:

**Proposition 4.3.** *When $U$ and $V$ ($X$ and $Y$) are independent, the cross interaction variables are pairwise independent.*

We note here that the pairwise independence is due to the balanced design from the binary expansion. Because of this orthogonality and pairwise independence, we can reduce the redundancy of information from different ways of partitioning the data, which in turn reduces the computation expenses. If we do not partition the data in this balanced way, we may not be able to get such efficiency.

### 4.3 The Interaction Symmetry and the Bonferroni BET

With the cross interaction variables, we state the main theorem for the proposed method:

**Theorem 4.4.** *$U$ and $V$ (or $X$ and $Y$) are independent if and only if all cross interactions, $\{A_{k_1} \dots A_{k_s} B_{k'_1} \dots B_{k'_t}\}_{s,t=1}^{\infty}$, are marginally mean 0.*

The main intuition of Theorem 4.4 is about the symmetry of independence: When $U$ and $V$ are independent, the counts of observations in the blue and white regions should be similar for any cross interaction. On the other hand, when $U$ and $V$ are not independent, we expect some strong asymmetry between the numbers of blue region points and white region points.

Theorem 4.4 immediately leads to the equivalence between the BET and a multiple testing problem: the BET at depth $d$ (testing the independence of $U_d$ and $V_d$) is equivalent to testing if all cross interactions up to depth $d$ are Rademacher (symmetric with mean zero). The advantage of this consideration is two-folded: (1) We reduce the test of a joint distribution (difficult) to that of marginal ones (simple). (2) We reduce the test of dependence (difficult) to that of the fairness of coins (simple).

Note that the equivalent multiple testing problem is a problem on controlling the family-wise error rate (FWER): Rejecting any coin being fair results in the rejection of independence between $U$ and $V$. The simplest FWER control is the Bonferroni procedure, where the

$p$-value is the minimum of 1 and $(2^d-1)^2$ times the smallest $p$-value of all marginal tests. We refer this procedure as the Bonferroni BET. Although the Bonferroni procedure can be conservative, it always provides a valid $p$-value. Also, since the dependence among the cross interaction variables are not strong (see the orthogonality and pairwise independence in Section 4.2), the Bonferroni BET might not be too conservative.

We also remark that the smallest possible $p$-value from the Bonferroni BET at depth $d$ with sample size $n$ is $2(2^d-1)^2/2^n$, where the $2^{-n}$ comes from the case when all points fall in blue or white and the factor 2 is from the two-sided test. Note that with such a "complete catch", the depth $d$ can reach a small fraction of $n$ before the test becomes powerless. Indeed, although in this case there are many empty rows or columns in the contingency table, globally there are still totally $n$ samples in the blue and white regions. Thus we would not run into the problem of insufficient samples. This is an improvement over the BET with classical methods where $d$ can be at most $O(\log n)$. Thus, with the Bonferroni BET, one can investigate more detailed dependence structures.

We conclude this section with an example showing the Bonferroni BET procedure at depth $d = 2$. See Figure 5. The Bonferroni BET with $d = 2$ for this dataset consists of the following four steps:

Step 1 : For each of the 9 cross interactions, we count the points in white and points in blue.

Step 2 : We consider the 9 two-sided tests of fairness of coins.

Step 3 : We look for the interaction with the strongest asymmetry, which is $A_1B_1A_2$ with 32 in white and 18 in blue. This gives the smallest $p$-value of 0.065.

Step 4 : Use the Bonferroni adjustment to multiply 9 and get the BET $p$-value of 0.585.

### 4.4 Examples and Interpretations of BET

In this section we explain the interpretations of the BET, i.e., we ask when the BET at depth $d$ is rejected, what can we say about the result? Generally, when we are describing the relationship between two variables through some statistical methods, e.g., regressions, we want to find "a smooth curve passing through the data cloud". This description immediately leads to two questions: (1) Does there really exist a "data cloud" that happens better than chance? (2) If there exists some "data cloud", where is it? The BET can explain both questions explicitly. We will describe these interpretations of the BET through the following simple examples.

1. Monotone relationship between $X$ and $Y$.

   When $Y$ is a monotone increasing function of $X$, after the probability integral transformation, $U$ and $V$ will be on the line of $u = v$. In this case, when the cross interaction $A_1B_1$ is considered, all points will either fall in the white region. See Figure 6. Thus, the $p$-value of the BET at depth 1 is $\frac{2}{2^n}$. The interpretation of rejection is that upper (lower) half of $x$'s are significantly more likely to appear together with




Figure 5: The 9 cross interactions when $d = 2$ with the counts of points in white and blue.

the upper (lower) half $y$'s. Note here that the statement is only about the two data blocks around the medians of $X$ and $Y$. However, such a statement does suggest a monotone relationship between the variables.

2. Quadratic relationship.
   When $Y = X^2$ and $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, after the probability integral transformation, $V$ is piecewise linear in $U$. In this case, when we truncate the binary expansion at depth $d = 2$, we find the strongest asymmetry with a complete catch by the interaction $A_1B_1A_2$ (Figure 7), with the $p$-value of the BET at depth 2 being $\frac{2\times(2^2-1)^2}{2^n}$. The interpretation of the result is visualized in Part (c) of Figure 7: The middle half $x$'s are significantly more likely to appear together with the lower half $y$'s, while the outer half $x$'s are significantly more likely to appear together with the upper half $y$'s.

   The above interpretation is about the local relationship between $X$ and $Y$. Although global relationship such as the linear regression provides useful information in many




Figure 6: (a) $Y$ is a monotone increasing function in $X$. (b) After the probability integral transformation, $U = V$. (c) The BET at depth 1: All observations fall in the white region for $A_1B_1$.




Figure 7: (a) $Y = X^2$ and $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. (b) After the probability integral transformation, $V$ is piecewise linear in $U$. (c) The BET at depth 2: All observations fall in the white region for $A_1B_1A_2$.

cases, for this example it does not accurately describe the joint behavior of $(U, V)$. On the other hand, by considering cross interaction variables in the Bonferroni BET, we can extract accurate information about the local relationship. The interpretability of local relationships is also an improvement of the Bonferroni BET from classical methods on the contingency table. In particular, the local relationship in this example suggests a polynomial fit of the data through the white regions.

3. Circular relationship.

   When $(X, Y)$ is sampled from the unit circle with $Y = \sin\theta$ and $X = \cos\theta$ with $\theta \sim Unif[0, 2\pi]$, after the probability integral transformation, $U$ and $V$ are dependent through an implicit function. See Figure 8. The strongest asymmetry for such dependence is fully captured by $A_1A_2B_1B_2$ when the Bonferroni BET at $d = 2$ is considered. The local relationship can be similarly interpreted. We note here that although the




Figure 8: (a) $Y = \sin\theta$ and $X = \cos\theta$ with $\theta \sim Unif[0, 2\pi]$. (b) After the probability integral transformation, $U$ and $V$ are dependent through an implicit function. (c) The BET at depth 2: All observations fall in the blue region for $A_1A_2B_1B_2$.

relationship between $X$ and $Y$ in this example is not functional, their joint behavior can still be well described with cross interaction variables. Moreover, the shape of the blue regions indicates that the relationship between $U$ and $V$ can possibly be explained by an implicit function passing through the blue regions. Since implicit functions can usually be described by parametric equations, significance at this cross interaction suggests a latent confounding variable that can explain the dependence. Indeed, in this example, the lurking variable $\theta$ can fully explain the dependence between $X$ and $Y$.

4. Bisection Expanding Cross.

   We now revisit the bisection expanding cross (BEX). With probability 1, points on


BEX with d=1 and BET with A1A2B1B2
BEX with d=2 and BET with A2A3B2B3
BEX with d=3 and BET with A3A4B3B4
BEX with d=4 and BET with A4A5B4B5

Figure 9: The bisection expanding cross (BEX) at $d = 1, \ldots, 4$ captured in the white regions of the BET.

$BEX_d$ fall in the white region for $A_dA_{d+1}B_dB_{d+1}$. This is the strongest asymmetry of $BEX_d$ which can be completely captured by the Bonferroni BET at depth $d+1$. See Figure 9. In particular, for the example in Section 2 with $n = 50$ and $d = 5$, the points all fall in the white region for $A_5B_5A_6B_6$, thus the $p$-value is $2(2^6 - 1)^2/2^{50} = 7.05036 \times 10^{-12}$. Although the uniform distribution over the BEX can be arbitrarily

close to independence, we can distinguish it from independence if we use a sufficiently large $d$. This result demonstrates the power of the binary expansion approach in studying dependence.

We note here that although rejections from the BET indicate the patterns in the data, they are different from earlier work in pattern recognition (Arias-Castro et al., 2005b), where nearly optimal results are obtained in Arias-Castro et al. (2005a). One difference between the methods is in that pattern recognition procedures often try to gradually approximate the clusters in the data by refining the local search, while in the BET procedure we check the global symmetry of orthogonal cross interaction variables. The asymmetry in the BET procedures does not necessarily mean the existence of clusters in the scatterplot of data, as in the BEX example.

### 4.5 Empirical BET and Sequential BET

In this section we discuss two practical issues on the applications of the BET: (1) What to do when the marginal distributions are unknown? (2) How do we know the right $d$ to use?

The first question leads to the problem of the empirical copula BET. When the marginal distributions are unknown, they can be approximated by the empirical CDF. We can then transform each variable with its empirical marginal CDF. We have studied the level of the empirical BET from simulation and found it valid when $d < \log_2 n$. One can also use Fisher's Exact test for $2 \times 2$ tables for each cross interaction because of the fixed margin, which is in a way similar as described in Lancaster (1949). As we will show in simulation studies, the BET with empirical CDF transformation works well when $n$ is large. However, careful asymptotic studies about the theory of the empirical copula BET are needed in future work.

The second question can be alleviated by considering a second level of multiple testing corrections, Bonferroni for example, over the searched depths. Although conservative, this consideration provides valid inference after the search process. We shall illustrate this procedure with a real dataset analysis. Recent work in sequential testing such as Foster and Stine (2008); G'Sell et al. (2016) with good stopping rules may lead to better power improvements. We will consider these extensions of our results in future work.

## 5 Simulation Studies

### 5.1 Bivariate Normal Distribution

In the first simulation study, we consider the bivariate normal distribution with correlation 0.3. We compare the power of the BET at $d = 1$ and that of the correlation and distance correlation based tests, which are known to be optimal for the bivariate normal distribution (Székely et al., 2007). We consider $n$ to range from 100 to 400, and we consider 1000




Figure 10: Comparison of powers of the BET with $d = 1$ and the tests based on correlation and distance correlation.

simulations for each $n$. The level of tests is set to be 0.1. From Figure 10, we see that all three tests are consistent. However, although the Bonferroni BET is consistent, in this case it is not as powerful as the tests based on correlation or distance correlation. This negative result is expected both because of the optimality of correlation and distance correlation under the bivariate normal model. One message from this simulation is that when one has some information about the joint distribution, it would be more powerful if one takes advantage of such model information and use an appropriate test for the model. This simulation study also suggests the need of improvement from the Bonferroni BET: The Bonferroni BET considers only the strongest asymmetry in cross interaction variables. In the bivariate normal case, when the correlation is non zero, many cross interaction variables will be asymmetric. Therefore, using only the strongest asymmetry will results in some loss of information. We will study the improvements of the Bonferroni BET by aggregating information from many cross interactions in future work.

## 5.2 Empirical BET on BEX

Although the BET might not be the most powerful test when the model is available, it is useful when we have no information about the joint distribution. Our second simulation

study is to consider again samples from the uniform distribution over $BEX_5$. If we assume known marginal distributions, then the Bonferroni BET with $d = 6$ will have very high power. Therefore, we consider here the empirical Bonferroni BET with $d = 6$ which uses the empirical CDF for the probability integral transformation. The level of this empirical BET is shown to be correct from simulations.

We again compare the performance with the tests based on correlation and distance correlation. We consider $n$ to range from 200 to 2000, and we consider 1000 simulations for each $n$. The level of tests is set to be 0.1. We observe from Figure 11 that the tests based




Figure 11: Comparison of powers of the BET with $d = 6$ and the tests based on correlation and distance correlation.

on correlation and distance correlation are powerless even when the sample size is increased to 2000. For the BET with $d = 6$, the power is not great when $n$ is small, which is expected since small errors in the empirical CDF could easily lead to wrong assignments to the blue or white regions when $d = 6$. However, as $n$ increases, the power of the empirical BET quickly goes up to 1. The result on this difficult example demonstrates the consistency of the empirical BET and indicates its practicability. In general, the BET outperforms correlation and distance correlation in detecting dependence that is through some implicit function, for example a circle, for the reasons described in Remark (1) in Section 2.1.

# 6 Are Stars Randomly Distributed in the Night Sky?

In this section we study the curious question of whether stars in the night sky are randomly distributed. Despite the simplicity of the statement of this long standing question, we are not aware of any complete scientific theory that explains the phenomenon with a confirming or disconfirming answer. In what follows, we provide some statistical analysis of this problem.

To study this question, we collected the galactic coordinates of the top 256 brightest stars in the night sky (Perryman et al., 1997). The galactic coordinates are essentially spherical coordinates with the Sun as the center. These coordinates consist of radius $r$, longitude $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ , and latitude $\theta \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2]$. We shall ignore the radius information and focus on the unit sphere. Since the density of the uniform distribution over the unit sphere is proportional to $\cos\theta d\phi d\theta$, as long as $X = \phi$ and $Y = \sin\theta$ of the stars are independent, the stars are uniformly distributed in the night sky.

In what follows, we test if $X$ and $Y$ are independent. We first consider the classical




Figure 12: (a) The longitude and sine latitude of the 256 brightest stars in the night sky. (b) The empirical copula distribution. The strongest asymmetry for the BET with $d = 2$ is found to be the interaction $A_1B_1A_2$, where 155 stars are in the white region and 101 are in the blue region.

tests. The sample correlation between $X$ and $Y$ is $-0.07$ with a $p$-value of 0.264, which is not significant. The distance correlation between $X$ and $Y$ is 0.137 with a $p$-value of 0.064. This $p$-value indicates weak evidence against independence. However, this statistic and this $p$-value do not provide information about the relationship between $X$ and $Y$, and the dependence pattern is vague.

We now consider applying the empirical Bonferroni BET on these data. The empirical

BET with $d = 1$ returns with a $p$-value of 0.235. For each of $d = 2, \ldots, 5$, the strongest asymmetry is all found to be $A_1A_2B_1$, where 155 stars are in the white region and 101 are in the blue region. The $p$-value at $d = 2$ is 0.008. However, since we have searched for $d = 1, \ldots, 5$, the Bonferroni adjusted $p$-value at $d = 2$ is $0.008 \times 5 = 0.04$, which is still significant.

A caveat here is that we regard the above analysis more as an illustration of the BET method rather than a big scientific discovery, which requires a much more careful study. For example, the only strong assumption in the BET approach is the i.i.d. assumption on the observations. This assumption might be violated when the data points are stars. Nevertheless, this example still illustrate the improvements of the BET over existing methods: Not only can we detect dependence under difficult situations, but also we can interpret a rejection with visualizations of the relationship. In this example, we find strong asymmetry between the white region and the blue region for $A_1A_2B_1$. This asymmetry suggests a polynomial fit of the data as Example 2 in Section 4.4. We note also that since data in this examples are angles that are periodic, one can "shift" the phase of $\phi$ to start from the observation corresponding to the first quartile of $U$. After the shift, a linear model can be fit to the data. Statistical inferences from the above polynomial or linear models need to be adjusted due to the pre-testing of the BET before the fit (Berk et al., 2013). Scientific explanations of the fits need even more careful studies. However, the interpretations from the BET to the stars data can still be of immediate practical value: For example, it can help people find bright stars in the night sky.

# 7 Summary and Discussions

Detecting dependence in a model-free setting is an important problem in statistics. It is also a difficult problem that can be intractable in general. To make this problem tractable, we introduce the concept of binary expansion statistics (BEStat), which combines three classical statistical wisdoms: copula, balanced design, and binary expansion. The proposed binary expansion testing (BET) procedure enjoys the invariance to monotone marginal transformation from the copula distribution, the symmetry, orthogonality, and clear interpretability from the balanced design, and the potential efficient bitwise computing implementation from the binary expansion.

The main purpose of the paper is to convey the ideas of BEStat and the BET rather than providing a complete theory or an optimal procedure. There are many potential extensions along this direction. Besides the theory and methods for the empirical BET and the sequential BET described in Section 4.5, some of the following problems could be interesting: (1) Improving the Bonferroni BET with more powerful procedures; (2) Testing conditional independence or causality with the BET; (3) Incorporating prior knowledge about the dependence through a Bayesian BET; (4) Checking the i.i.d. condition with the BET; (5) Other model-free inference such as model-free confidence interval and/or prediction with BEStat; (6) Efficient software implementing BEStat through bitwise operations.

While we were preparing the manuscript, we became aware of the very recent work of

Ma (2016). In this paper, the author introduced the new method of Fisher exact scanning, which is different but similar as the Bonferroni BET described in Section 4.3. Similar ideas can also be found in Filippi and Holmes (2015). Compared to Ma (2016), our motivation is from the intractability of model-free dependence detection, our focus is on the theoretical foundation the BEStat concept and the BET framework, and our procedure is based on the study of cross interaction variables from binary expansions. We welcome further thoughts on related topics for deeper understanding of dependence and useful procedures in practice.

## Acknowledgement

The author thanks Richard Berk, Lawrence D. Brown, Andreas Buja, Edward George, Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla, Linda Zhao, and Zhigen Zhao for inspiring discussions that stimulated this research. The author also thanks Jianqing Fan, Ruth Heller, Xiaoming Huo, Han Liu, Li Ma, Zongming Ma, Xiao-Li Meng, Richard Samworth, David Siegmund, Dylan Small, Weijie Su, Gábor Székely, Xinlu Tan, Daniel Yekutieli, Yuan Yuan, Cun-Hui Zhang, and Nancy Zhang for valuable comments and suggestions.

This research is completed while the author is visiting Princeton University. The author thanks Jianqing Fan and the Department of Operations Research and Financial Engineering at Princeton for the warm hospitality. This research is also partially supported by NSF DMS-1613112 and NSF IIS-1633212.

## References

Agresti, A. and Kateri, M. (2011), *Categorical data analysis*, Springer.

Arias-Castro, E., Donoho, D. L., and Huo, X. (2005a), "Near-optimal detection of geometric objects by fast multiscale methods," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51, 2402–2425.

Arias-Castro, E., Donoho, D. L., Huo, X., and Tovey, C. A. (2005b), "Connect the dots: How many random points can a regular curve pass through?" *Advances in applied probability*, 571–603.

Berk, R., Brown, L., Buja, A., Zhang, K., and Zhao, L. (2013), "Valid post-selection inference," *The Annals of Statistics*, 41, 802–837.

Box, G. E., Hunter, J. S., and Hunter, W. G. (2005), *Statistics for experimenters: design, innovation, and discovery*, vol. 2, Wiley-Interscience New York.

Breiman, L. and Friedman, J. H. (1985), "Estimating optimal transformations for multiple regression and correlation," *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 80, 580–598.

Casella, G. and Berger, R. L. (2002), *Statistical inference*, vol. 2, Duxbury Pacific Grove, CA.

Cox, D. R. and Reid, N. (2000), *The theory of the design of experiments*, CRC Press.

Craiu, R. V. and Meng, X.-L. (2005), "Multiprocess parallel antithetic coupling for backward and forward Markov chain Monte Carlo," *Annals of Statistics*, 661–697.

— (2006), "Meeting Hausdorff in Monte Carlo: a surprising tour with antihype fractals," *Statistica Sinica*, 77–91.

Fienberg, S. E. (2007), *The analysis of cross-classified categorical data*, Springer Science & Business Media.

Filippi, S. and Holmes, C. (2015), "A Bayesian nonparametric approach to testing for dependence between random variables," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.00829*.

Forsyth, D. A. and Ponce, J. (2002), *Computer vision: a modern approach*, Prentice Hall Professional Technical Reference.

Foster, D. P. and Stine, R. A. (2008), "$\alpha$-investing: a procedure for sequential control of expected false discoveries," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 70, 429–444.

G'Sell, M. G., Wager, S., Chouldechova, A., and Tibshirani, R. (2016), "Sequential selection procedures and false discovery rate control," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 78, 423–444.

Heller, R., Heller, Y., and Gorfine, M. (2012), "A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances," *Biometrika*, ass070.

Heller, R., Heller, Y., Kaufman, S., Brill, B., and Gorfine, M. (2016), "Consistent distribution-free $K$-sample and independence tests for univariate random variables," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17, 1–54.

Kac, M. (1959), *Statistical independence in probability, analysis and number theory*, vol. 134, Mathematical Association of America.

Kimeldorf, G. and Sampson, A. R. (1978), "Monotone Dependence," *Ann. Statist.*, 6, 895–903.

Lancaster, H. (1949), "The derivation and partition of $\chi 2$ in certain discrete distributions," *Biometrika*, 36, 117–129.

Lehmann, E. L. and Romano, J. P. (2006), *Testing statistical hypotheses*, Springer Science & Business Media.

Liu, K. and Meng, X.-L. (2014), "Comment: A Fruitful Resolution to Simpsons Paradox via Multiresolution Inference," *The American Statistician*, 68, 17–29.

— (2016), "There Is Individualized Treatment. Why Not Individualized Inference?" *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 3, 79–111.

Ma, L. (2016), "Fisher exact scanning for dependency," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.07885*.

Miller, R. and Siegmund, D. (1982), "Maximally selected chi square statistics," *Biometrics*, 1011–1016.

Nelsen, R. B. (2007), *An introduction to copulas*, Springer Science & Business Media.

Perryman, M. A., Lindegren, L., Kovalevsky, J., Hoeg, E., Bastian, U., Bernacca, P., Crézé, M., Donati, F., Grenon, M., Grewing, M., et al. (1997), "The HIPPARCOS catalogue," *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 323.

Rényi, A. (1959), "On measures of dependence," *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, 10, 441–451.

Reshef, D. N., Reshef, Y. A., Finucane, H. K., Grossman, S. R., McVean, G., Turnbaugh, P. J., Lander, E. S., Mitzenmacher, M., and Sabeti, P. C. (2011), "Detecting novel associations in large data sets," *science*, 334, 1518–1524.

Reshef, D. N., Reshef, Y. A., Sabeti, P. C., and Mitzenmacher, M. M. (2015a), "An empirical study of leading measures of dependence," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.02214*.

Reshef, Y. A., Reshef, D. N., Sabeti, P. C., and Mitzenmacher, M. M. (2015b), "Equitability, interval estimation, and statistical power," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.02212*.

Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2013a), "The distance correlation t-test of independence in high dimension," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 117, 193–213.

— (2013b), "Energy statistics: A class of statistics based on distances," *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 143, 1249–1272.

Székely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L., and Bakirov, N. K. (2007), "Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances," *The Annals of Statistics*, 35, 2769–2794.

Székely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L., et al. (2009), "Brownian distance covariance," *The annals of applied statistics*, 3, 1236–1265.

Vitale, R. A. (1990), "On Stochastic Dependence and a Class of Degenerate Distributions," *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 16, 459–469.

Wang, X., Jiang, B., and Liu, J. S. (2016), "Generalized R-squared for Detecting Non-independence," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.02736*.